

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q68837

Kazuo KURODA

Allowed: September 24, 2007

Appln. No.: 10/091,027

Group Art Unit: 2621

Confirmation No.: 6418

Examiner: Hung Q. DANG

Filed: March 6, 2002

For: DUPLICATION CONTROLLING METHOD, DUPLICATION CONTROLLING APPARATUS, RECORDING MEDIUM AND DUPLICATION CONTROLLING PROGRAM EMBODIED ON COMPUTER-READABLE MEDIUM

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

ATTN: MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

REMARKS

Applicant offers the following comments in response to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance set forth on pages 2-3 of the Notice of Allowability dated September 24, 2007. The Reasons for Allowance identifies a particular feature recited in independent claims 1, 7, 20, and 29, as rendering the claims patentable over the prior art of record.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's statement should not be misinterpreted as meaning that the identified feature is the only patentable feature in any of the claims. The independent claims and the dependent claims also include various other aspects which provide a separate basis for patentability. The Examiner's statement emphasizes certain

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

U.S. Application No.: 10/091,027

Attorney Docket No.: Q68837

aspects of the claims, but each claim should be interpreted using its own precise language, without inferring any particular emphasis from the Examiner's statement.

Patent Office personnel are requested to note that the present submission does not adversely affect the patent term adjustment accrued by the Applicant to date. As emphasized in the "Clarification of 37 C.F.R. §1.704(c)(10) – Reduction of Patent Term Adjustment for Certain Types of Papers Filed After a Notice of Allowance Has Been Mailed," 1247OG111 (6/26/01), "a response to the examiner's reasons for allowance" is an example of a paper that does "not cause substantial interference and delay in the patent issue process" and is "not considered a 'failure to engage in reasonable efforts' to conclude processing or examination of the application." Therefore, the Applicant remains entitled to the full patent term adjustment set forth on page 3 of the Notice of Allowance dated September 24, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



~~Quadeer A. Ahmed~~
Registration No. 60,835

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 10, 2007